

Workmentor – Training of Trainers course (ToT) delivered in Nantes in August 2012.

The objectives for the training:

1. To introduce the skills of mentoring
2. To identify and evaluate the materials to be used in a work mentoring course
3. To identify how the materials will be used in each participant country
4. To identify how the materials will be piloted and evaluated

SWOT-analysis based on partners reflection (ToT course, pm3), field work and conversation with partners.

Strength

- Good venue
- No distractions
- Good environment
- Everybody showed goodwill
- Acquaintance helps to break the ice.
- Well motivated participants, each partner willing to participate in exercises and discussion
- A balanced program for the moment and function in the project
- Flexibility to react to situations
- Presentation was well done and appropriate
- Good exchange and discussions after each exercise
- Good interactive exercises taken directly from the handbook (WorkMentor: A training pack for mentors in the workplace)
- Active participation
- Participants built the training pack together in PM2 so they knew the content and have had time to reflect on it before PM3
- Effective and informative to ask groups from each country to use SMART targets to plan what they would do next
- Entertaining trainer
- Pace was appropriate
- Short activities with impact
- Opportunity for on-going reflection and discussion
- Relaxed and open atmosphere
- Everyone had experiences to bring to the discussions
- Respect and trust in the room
- Everyone well-prepared
- No internet access during the meeting

Weakness

- Executing the course requires probably more time
- Lack of information on how to get in touch with the employer and examples of mentoring agreements.
- The goals were to identify and evaluate the materials to be used in a work mentoring course. It did not happen as it was expected
- The piloting evaluation was done before the piloting action plan it would have been better to have it after as it was presented in the agenda
- When the group goes home before the meeting ends
- Not talked about the interim report as it was announced in the agenda

- Good working conditions
- Work in different groups with persons of different countries
- Share experience with people of different culture
- Focus on pertinent things

Opportunity

- To change course in suitable units to ensure a full understanding of its purpose
- Effective to have pairs of partners from different country accomplish exercises
- Extend the course to day and a half
- When deliver course to unknown audience, then include all aspects of the training like Mentoring Agreements and Action Planning examples (SMART – targets)
- Work in different groups with persons of different countries
- Share experience with people of different culture
- It was felt that the training pack was not the final version and further development was taken on during ToT and this is seen as essential
- It would have improved the course if it have included examples of mentoring agreements and action plans
- Define specific words that belong to the course in the beginning of it to avoid difficulties of understanding and to help new participants

Threats

- To much information in short time according to day 1 can prevent full understanding of the course
- If the purpose of the course is not well explained taking into account those who are new to project
- language difficulties
- Difficult to choose the materials in piloting

SWOT PM3

Strength

- Good communication within the group
- All participants aware of the project work-packages
- Work-packages have been delegated throughout the group
- Good respect and trust within the group
- Good progress according to the project plan
- Good communication prior to the meeting and during to ensure that any issues are clarified and agreed effectively
- No inhibitions about talking and discussing issues
- Strong partnership

Weakness

- Absence of Wi-Fi
- Slight language difficulties. Some voices not strong enough to be heard. A bit more difficult for those who do not have English as a mother tongue

- Confidence within the group
- Flexibility within the meeting to enable all concerns to be voiced and discussed appropriately
- Invitation of new participants bring new blood and energy to the group
- Project efficient because many of the partners used to work together for several years
- Well motivated participants, each partner willing to participate in the project
- The venue and the pace of the meeting was conducive to effective working practices
- Useful to know how each country approach the task of the meeting and have information about what work for them and what did not.
- To begin on time according to time-schedule of the agenda
- Exchange of problems and solutions
- Good schedule and well established
- Each partner knew what he has to do
- Organization
- Use of card and bus of the school
- School near the city, railway station and airport
- Local visit

Opportunity

- Prior to the meeting inform delegates about facilities like if there is no internet access to ensure people know and can take that in count
- Have internet access fx. in the sleeping room
- To visit company where the students are learning, to know better in which conditions they are learning

Threats

How good was the event?

No	Performance Indicator	Themes	4	3	2	1
1	Quality of the trans-national element					
1.1	Input into the event by the project partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent to which each partner contributes to the event The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the event 		X		
1.2	Links between the aims of the event and the overall aims of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mutual understanding amongst partners about the project and event rationale and the short term and long term objectives of the event Clear evidence in the event programme of real synergy with the overall objectives of the project 	X			
1.3	Development of positive attitudes towards Europe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities for the development of positive attitudes towards Europe and towards transnational activities The extent and quality of the intercultural dimension The extent of opportunities for participants to share information about their own countries and education systems 	X			
1.4	Promotion of other languages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent and quality of the opportunities for the use of various languages both by trainers and by participants Evidence of strategies for overcoming language difficulties 	X ₁		X	
1.5	Representation from a variety of countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent to which a reasonable representation of participants from various countries has been achieved 		X		

¹ Participants really tried to overcome language difficulties

No	Performance Indicator	Themes	4	3	2	1
2	Structure, content and delivery of the event/project					
2.1	Organisation of the transnational event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of clear planning Realistic timescales Appropriate selection of delegates 	X X X			
2.2	Effectiveness of content and appropriate range and balance of activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate content, clearly related to the aims and objectives of the event Relevant mixture of activities e.g. icebreaking activities, didactic sessions, workshops, social activities, free time Appropriateness of the social programme 	X X	X		
2.3	Effectiveness of the delivery by trainers, workshop leaders etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trainers and leaders have the appropriate subject competence and knowledge Trainers and leaders are good communicators with the necessary language skills Trainers and leaders have the appropriate didactic experience for delivering professional development 	X X X			
2.4	Effectiveness of shared ownership of the event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the needs and expectations of participants have been taken into account Evidence that participants have the opportunity to contribute their own expertise 	X X	X		
2.5	Effectiveness of the process of monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of the mechanism for evaluation both short term and long term including follow-up activities, if appropriate Evidence of on-going assistance to participants, if appropriate 		X	X	

No	Performance Indicator	Themes	4	3	2	1
3	Materials, resources and equipment					
3.1	Provision and suitability of materials, resources and equipment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of appropriate prior information being issued to participants Relevance and quality of materials issued during the event Sufficiency, range and suitability of other resources, including, where appropriate, ICT 	X X	X		

No	Performance Indicator	Themes	4	3	2	1
4	Quality of the domestic arrangements					
4.1	Quality and appropriateness of the domestic arrangements and the comfort factor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attention to practical details and catering Suitability of the working venue Quality of overnight accommodation, if appropriate 	X X ²		X ³	

1	Quality of the trans-national element	35/40 = 0,88
2	Structure, content and delivery of the event/project	47/52=0,90
3	Materials, resources and equipment	11/12=0,92
4	Quality of the domestic arrangements	10/12=0,83
=		3,53/4=0,88

Project meeting

Evaluation of progress made during the meeting

INDICATORS:

- Sufficient information was sent before the meeting and communication was efficient
- Partners were given time for introductions (or re-introductions) and had time to update each other on their backgrounds and what they can bring to the project
- The agenda has been respected and any changes negotiated
- Partners have all contributed to the meeting
- The goals of the meeting were met
- The working environment was adequate for the proposed tasks
- Planned activities have taken place
- The partners have a clear idea of their next steps
- The accommodation, food and social element were adequate

QUESTIONS:

Preparatory work	yes	no	Comments
Was sufficient information supplied before the meeting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Provide more information about

2 No Wi-Fi and not easy to connect to the internet (3-4)

3 Inform partners what to expect about the accommodation . It creates security and partners find it easier to prepare for the meeting/travel

			quality of the overnight accommodation, no WiFi and not easy to connect to the internet
Was the work load prior to the meeting acceptable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Did partners achieve the tasks their were supposed to deliver before the meeting?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The meeting itself	Yes	no	Comments
Did the meeting give adequate time to introductions and finding out the background of the partners?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Are partners satisfied that their were able to contribute to the discussion and decision making?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Slight language difficulties
Did the meeting adhere to the agenda and were any changes discussed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Information about the piloting arrangements and how it will be evaluated was moved between days
Were the goals of the meeting achieved?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Almost all goals achieved
Are some goals not met?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Evaluating materials (WorkMentor package)
Other factors	yes	no	Comments
Was the working environment satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good
Were the accommodation, food and the social element satisfactory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	Yes, everything was fine except the bedroom, shower and restroom. And no Internet connection in the sleeping area.
Partners now know each other well (professionally)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Follow-up	yes	no	Comments
There is a clear and reasonable timetable in place	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	Yes always, except once when event in the agenda had to move forward because the partner that was in charge of this event was leaving earlier than was expected when the agenda was planned
Partners understand their role in the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>	Everyone knows what their role is in the project

Thank you for your contribution to this evaluation process and best wishes,
Sólveig Zophoníasdóttir
School Development Centre of UNAK's Faculty of Education
University of Akureyri Iceland
sz@unak.is